

## BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

## STATE OF WASHINGTON

SADU SINGH,

Appellant,

V.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH  
SERVICES.

Respondent.

Case No. ALLO-99-0037

## ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

**Hearing on Exceptions.** This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair; GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair; and LEANA D. LAMB, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated October 27, 1999. The hearing was held on April 12, 2000, in the Personnel Appeals Board hearing room in Olympia, Washington.

**Appearances.** Appellant Sadhu Singh was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) was represented by Jesse Powell, Classification and Compensation Manager.

**Background.** On May 28, 1999, Appellant requested reallocation of his Stationary Engineer 3 position by submitting a classification questionnaire (CQ) to Respondent's Personnel Office. Appellant requested that his position be reallocated to the Plant Manager 2 classification. By letter dated June 29, 1999, Respondent denied Appellant's request for reallocation. Appellant appealed to the Department of Personnel (DOP). The Department of Personnel received Appellant's appeal on July 16, 1999. The Director's determination was issued on October 27, 1999. The Director's

1 designee, Mary Ann Parsons, concluded that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On  
2 November 29, 1999, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel  
3 Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

4  
5 Appellant works at Rainier School. His working title is Chief Engineer. Appellant is responsible  
6 for managing the operation and maintenance of a high pressure steam generating plant which  
7 includes the supervision of four stationary engineers and three intermittent stationary engineers.

8  
9 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that he performs the same duties and  
10 responsibilities as three other Stationary Engineer 3 positions, one located in the Department of  
11 General Administration at the Olympia Capital Campus, one located in Sedro Wooley, and one  
12 located in the Department of Corrections in Monroe. These three positions were reallocated to the  
13 Plant Manager 2 classification in June 1998. Therefore, Appellant asserts that his position should  
14 be reallocated to Plant Manager 2.

15  
16 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent contends that Appellant has responsibility for  
17 the steam plant but does not have responsibility for the entire facility as required for allocation to  
18 the Plant Manager 2 classification. Respondent further contends that the allocation or misallocation  
19 of positions located in other agencies should not be a consideration in allocating Appellant's  
20 position. Respondent asserts that Appellant's position is fully described by the Stationary Engineer  
21 3 classification and that his position is properly allocated.

22  
23 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position is properly  
24 allocated to the Stationary Engineer 3 classification should be affirmed.

1 **Relevant Classifications.** Stationary Engineer 3, class code 75140, and Plant Manager 2, class  
2 code 75720.

3  
4 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
5 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
6 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
7 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
8 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
9 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
10 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
11 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

12  
13 While a comparison of one position to another similar position may be useful in gaining a better  
14 understanding of the duties performed by and the level of responsibility assigned to an incumbent,  
15 allocation of a position must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities assigned to an  
16 individual position compared to the existing classifications. The allocation or misallocation of a  
17 similar position is not a determining factor in the appropriate allocation of a position. Flahaut v.  
18 Dept's of Personnel and Labor and Industries, PAB No. ALLO 96-0009 (1996).

19  
20 The Plant Manager 2 classification encompasses positions that perform maintenance, repair,  
21 alteration and construction of buildings, equipment, and grounds; **and** supervise building trades  
22 journey-level workers; **and** manage the operation of a high-pressure heating plant. In his CQ,  
23 Appellant indicates that 100 percent of his duties and responsibilities involve managing and  
24 operating a high pressure steam generating plant and supervising subordinate stationary engineers.  
25 He does not have the scope or breadth of responsibility for maintenance, repair, alteration and  
26 construction of buildings, equipment and grounds anticipated by the Plant Manager 2 classification.

1  
2 The Stationary Engineer 3 classification encompasses positions that are responsible for the overall  
3 operation and maintenance of a “high pressure heating plant consisting of two or more boilers over  
4 150 h.p. each.” Furthermore, incumbents assigned to this classification supervise skilled and  
5 semiskilled workers engaged in the operation, maintenance and repair of steam boilers and auxiliary  
6 equipment. Appellant’s duties and responsibilities at Rainier School are fully encompassed by this  
7 classification and his position is properly allocated.

8  
9 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director’s  
10 determination dated October 27, 1999, should be affirmed and adopted.

11 **ORDER**

12 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is  
13 denied and the Director’s determination dated October 27, 1999, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is  
14 attached.

15 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2000.

16 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

17  
18  
19 \_\_\_\_\_  
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

20  
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

22  
23 \_\_\_\_\_  
Leana D. Lamb, Member

24  
25  
26  
Personnel Appeals Board  
2828 Capitol Boulevard  
Olympia, Washington 98504